

**Red River Valley Water Supply Studies
Study Review Team
April 19, 2001
Holiday Inn, Fargo ND**

OPENING REMARKS

Greetings and opening remarks were provided by the members of the Study Management Team which includes:

Dennis Breitzman - Area Manager of the Dakotas Area Office, Bureau of Reclamation (Reclamation)
Dale Frink ? Acting State Engineer, North Dakota State Water Commission (SWC)
Warren Jamison ? Manager, Garrison Diversion Conservancy District (C-District)

Dennis Breitzman gave a brief summary of the types of projects Reclamation is involved with in the Dakotas, which includes reservoir operations, irrigation, MR&I water supply systems and much more. He referenced Section 8 of the Dakota Water Resources Act (DWRA) that authorizes the Secretary of Interior to conduct a comprehensive study of the needs and alternatives associated with meeting the water needs of the Red River Valley. The goal is to do an objective study through an open and public process. This Study Review Team is a vehicle for various stakeholders to keep up with the happenings of the studies without having to be involved in the day-to-day activities. These day-to-day activities will be handled by the Technical Team.

Dale Frink noted that this is probably the most important study to be conducted in eastern North Dakota in a long time. Everything depends on water, and in North Dakota we have adequate supplies but inadequate distribution systems. This study is similar yet different than previous studies done by the State Water Commission. The study will look at the water needs of the area and the alternatives for water sources, but the major difference is that this study involves international and inter-state issues. Therefore it is very important to do this study in accordance with the law. Dale encouraged the community leaders present to become involved in this study and share the information with their peers. Communities need to be involved and promote the study.

Warren Jamison provided a brief history of the Garrison Diversion Unit (GDU) project. The C-District is the official state sponsor for GDU and represents 26 counties. The C-District has worked with the State Water Commission and Bureau of Reclamation on many different projects. The DWRA is an amendment to the 1986 Reformulation Act. DWRA authorizes the comprehensive study of the water needs within the valley. The State Water Commission and the C-District have volunteered to share in the costs of this important study. The proposed cost share is 20% of the estimated cost of \$3 million for planning the project. The cost share would be split equally by the State Water Commission and C-District. The goal is to complete the comprehensive studies in three years, but this is an estimate.

The C-District doesn't presume that the completion of GDU is the solution to Red River Valley water needs. The C-District Board has passed a formal resolution supporting the investigation of all options to meet the water needs of the valley. A copy of the resolution can be found on the C-District's web site. There are three basic categories of alternatives being looked at in this study effort: No Action, in-basin solutions, and inter-basin solutions. There is no predetermined solution. Each alternative will be evaluated equally and the study will be carried out in accordance with the law.

The DWRA requires the Secretary of Interior to prepare two reports: the needs and options study and an Environmental Impact Statement. The Secretary doesn't have to do all the work and that is why we are meeting today. The Study Review Team and the Technical Team were established to assist the Secretary in this effort.

MEMORANDUM OF UNDERSTANDING

Dennis gave an overview of the Memorandum of Understanding (MOU) signed by the Study Management Team. The Study Management Team is responsible for getting the work done, making decisions, and bringing resources to the table. The MOU established a Technical Team and a Study Review Team. The Technical Team is designed to perform the studies and be involved with the day-to-day activities. The Study Review Team members will have input into the study process and be involved in the review of the study products. The MOU listed various entities as members of each of these teams but these were not assignments. If an organization feels they should be a member of the other team or have representation on both teams please inform Signe Snortland, Red River Study Team Leader .

STUDY FRAMEWORK PRESENTATION

Signe Snortland gave a presentation of the framework for the Red River Valley studies. Copies of this presentation are available upon request. The main purpose of this meeting is to review the Master Plan of Study and get input from the Study Review Team. Previous studies related to this effort are available in hard copy or on CD. The previous studies were done at the appraisal level, and we are tasked with investigating the needs and alternatives at the feasibility level. This study is not limited to investigating only the alternatives identified in the previous studies but this is a place from which to start. During the public scoping sessions we will likely identify other alternatives to assess.

The presentation covered topics such as:

- ? Section 8 of the Dakota Water Resources Act
- ? Review of the roles of the Study Management Team, Study Review Team and the Technical Team
- ? Review of the Master POS and how it relates to specific plans of study for the various study components
- ? Public involvement strategy
- ? Study time-line

A list of the Study Review Team members was provided and attendees were asked to review it and notify Signe of any corrections. Other entities were invited to attend, and hopefully will decide to participate.

The Technical Team has met twice to create the Master POS. Minutes from these meetings are still in draft form but will be posted on the study's website when they are finalized. The next meeting of this group is scheduled for May 2 in Bismarck. The goal of the May meeting is to complete the Master POS and discuss the priority for writing the specific plans of study.

Questions

Gary Pearson asked how streamflow augmentation and groundwater recharge fit into the needs assessment. A response to this question will be provided later on in this meeting when we review the Master POS.

Mike Ell asked if we are going to be assessing the needs of the Red River Valley or the Red River Basin. Signe explained that the assessment of the needs will include the 13 eastern counties in North Dakota and the three Minnesota communities identified during the previous studies. Other water systems or communities interested in being included in the needs assessment should request inclusion. The Study Management Team will take their request into consideration.

Dr. William Franzin asked if this study will assess water sources outside North Dakota. The answer to this question is yes. We will consider all reasonable sources, surface water and groundwater.

FORMULATION OF STUDY REVIEW TEAM

Minutes from these meeting will be prepared and provided to the team members in draft form. After review and comment the minutes will be finalized and posted on the study's website (Website still under construction).

The group decided to meet as necessary when there are products to review. The next meeting will be held on June 15, 2001 in Fargo. The Technical Team is meeting in Fargo on June 14.

Information about the meetings, minutes, and other study products will be distributed via e-mail. At this time there are some who can not access the attachments. If this continues to be a problem the material can be distributed in hard copy.

This group prefers to have their documents produced with Microsoft WORD.

A list of the Technical Team membership will be provided to the Study Review Team members.

REVIEW OF MASTER PLAN OF STUDY

Dean Karsky reviewed the contents of the Master POS. The Study Review Team members were asked to review the draft Master POS and provide comments to Signe Snortland by April 27, 2001. This is a short deadline but we would like to incorporate any comments from this group prior to the next Technical Team meeting which is scheduled for May 2, 2001.

Dean walked the group through the various sections of the Master POS and highlighted sections that had not already been discussed in this meeting. Specifically noted sections including the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA), study scope, needs assessment, alternatives, and specific study components. The Phase II executive summary (included in meeting packet) provides a good background information on this project.

In response to Gary Pearson's question on streamflow augmentation and groundwater recharge being considered as needs in this study, this is briefly discussed on page 11 of the Master POS and will be addressed in more detail when the specific Plans of Study are developed.

Genevieve Thompson asked if measures such as riparian restoration and the water conservation benefits associated with it will be addressed in the engineering study component or the environmental study component. The response was that it will be addressed in both sections. There are many aspects of this study that are inter-related and do not fit into just one study component. Water quality is another example of this. The Technical Team will be working to ensure that these aspects are properly addressed wherever appropriate.

Gary Pearson noted that one week to review this Master POS is not adequate to do a thorough review, and in the future it will be necessary to allow a more reasonable time frame to review study products. This concern was noted. Team members were asked to provide whatever comments they could by April 27 but comments received after this date will still be considered. The Master POS is a fluid document and will be changed as needed as we proceed with the study.

Mike Ell asked if one of the study components is going to address flood control options, and how this may impact the needs. The Corp of Engineers is studying flood control options and we have met with them to discuss opportunities to share data. They are willing to share data and models with us. We are going to coordinate our study efforts in order to avoid duplication. A representative from the Corps' Red River Reconnaissance Study team is a member of our Technical Team.

COMMENTS ON TABLE TOP DISPLAYS

The Study Review Team previewed table top displays which describe the basic components of the Master POS. These displays will be used at public scoping meetings and the Study Review Team was asked to comment on the content of the displays. The following comments were received:

- C Study Introduction display ? the Red River Basin map 50 degree latitude line is wrong. The 50 degree latitudinal line runs through Selkirk and the 49 degree latitudinal line is on the Canadian-United States border. Need to check the 48 degree latitudinal line also. This will be corrected.
- C Alternatives display - (1) Need to create a graphic to illustrate ?other alternatives identified elsewhere? and not just the alternatives identified in previous studies. (2) The colors on the alternative maps do not match the color code associated with them. The aquifer color is wrong. (3) It is difficult to see the main feature presented on the alternative maps. Suggest zeroing in on the main feature with another map to identify the general location of the specific area.
- C Needs display ? (1) text associated with Industrial needs should be changed - ?..an industry to move..? should be changed to ?industries? (2) industrial photo should be changed to show a ?greener? landscape around the facility.
- C General Questions ? (1) Will the study cover the feasibility and O&M cost of water treatment waste disposal? The answer is yes, and this will be addressed in more detail in the specific plan of study. (2) Why does the Missouri River depletion study end at St. Louis? Why does it not include the Mississippi River below St. Louis? The answer is the scope of the depletion study is yet to be determined. If during the scoping process a need is identified to include a larger area, this will be considered.

GENERAL DISCUSSION

Discussion: Master POS ? Needs Section ? Industrial needs - Gary Pearson raised the question of whether we are moving industries from another area into the Red River Valley. Are we moving industries into the valley which could be located elsewhere that already has an adequate water supply? Are we going to consider the negative impacts that may result?

Dr. William Franzin agrees with this point and in a quick review of the Master POS feels there is a preeminence of the word ?growth? throughout the document. We should be taking industrial development to the areas of adequate water supply instead of taking water to the Red River Valley in order to attract industrial development.

Response: It is not the intention to create a ?growth? scenario. This section of the Master POS, in part, is intended to show the need to conduct a sensitivity analysis of industrial needs. If the current text does not adequately state this, provide other suggestions for the text.

Dale Frink also pointed out that growth is very important to North Dakota. North Dakota ranks 50th among the 50 states in terms of growth. We don't want to put ourselves in the situation where we limit growth due to water.

Discussion: Mike Ell noted that rural development is very important. During the scoping process we need to look at needs outside the immediate valley.

Response: Signe noted the suggestion made at the last Technical Team meeting to include the needs of communities and water systems within the basin and not limit it to the study area of the previous studies. The Study Management Team will take this into consideration.

Discussion: Master POS-page 30 - Jim Linnertz asked if there would be impacts to the wastewater treatment if the ratio of water to solids in the wastewater was too low to due water conservation measures.

Response: This is not likely to be an issue, but the Technical Team was established to identify and study such issues.

Discussion: Should there be representation on the Technical Team by someone with wastewater expertise?

Response: We do have representation by the Minnesota Pollution Control Board but if there are others who should be represented, let us know. Mike Ell promised to suggest to the Health Department that a wastewater specialist from the ND Health Department attend the Technical Team meetings.

Comments From Study Review Team Members after Adjournment

Master POS ? page 30 ? facets? should be changed to ? faucets?

Master POS ? page 29 ? typical? should be changed to ? typically?

What water sources are being considered inside and outside the basin? What are the exact boundaries of the valley versus basin versus water supply?

Agenda Items for Next Meeting

- ? Review Study Review Team meeting minutes
- ? Review Master Plan of Study
- ? Review of May 2, 2001 Technical Team meeting minutes
- ? Discuss preparation of specific POS

MEETING ATTENDANCE SHEET
Red River Valley Water Supply Study Review Team, April 19,
Holiday Inn ? Fargo, North Dakota

	Name	Organization	Phone
1	Dick McCabe	Garrison Diversion Conservancy District	(701) 222-
2	Bill Lambrecht	St. Louis Post ? Dispatch	(202) 298-
3	Tami Norgard	Vogel Law Firm / Garrison Diversion Conservancy District	(701) 237-
4	Riley Rogers	Valley City Commission	(701) 845-
5	Jerry Blomeke	Eastern Dakota Water Users Association	(701) 428-
6	Gary Pearson	National Wildlife Federation	(701) 252-
7	Dale Frink	ND State Water Commission	(701) 328-
8	Barry D. Johnson	City of West Fargo	(701) 282-
9	Kevin Bucholz	Moore Engineering	(701) 282-
10	Bruce Grubb	City of Fargo	(701) 241-
11	Leanne Chojnacki	Missouri Department of Natural Resources	(573) 751-
12	Jim Linnertz	ND Wildlife Federation	(701) 235-
13	Bill Franzin	North Central Division of American Fisheries Society	(204) 983-
14	Jerry Schaack	Garrison Diversion Conservancy District	(701) 652-
15	Jeffrey Mattern	ND State Water Commission	(701) 328-
16	Randy Gjestvang	ND State Water Commission	(701) 282-
17	Mylo Einarson	City of Grafton	(701) 352-
18	Ed Cryer	Montgomery Watson Engineering	(208) 345-
19	Rick St. Germain	Houston Engineering / Garrison Diversion Conservancy District	(701) 237-
20	George Houston	Houston Engineering / Garrison Diversion Conservancy District	(701) 237-
21	Lawrence Woodbury	Houston Engineering / Garrison Diversion Conservancy District	(701) 237-
22	Mike Ell	North Dakota Chapter of The Wildlife Society	(701) 223-
23	Charles S. Vein	Advanced Engineering / Grand Forks	(701) 746-
24	Gary L. Hultberg	East Grand Forks Water & Light	(218) 773-
25	Cliff McLain	Moorhead Public Service	(218) 299-
26	Hazel Feters-Sletten	City of Grand Forks	(701) 746-
27	Amy Ambuehl	Bureau of Reclamation	(701) 250-
28	Conrad Jordheim	Bureau of Reclamation	(701) 250-
29	Darrin Goetzfried	Bureau of Reclamation	(701) 250-
30	Ryan Newman	Bureau of Reclamation	(701) 250-
31	Alicia Waters	Bureau of Reclamation	(701) 250-
32	Signe Snortland	Bureau of Reclamation	(701) 250-
33	Dean Karsky	Bureau of Reclamation	(701) 250-
34	Greg Hiemenz	Bureau of Reclamation	(701) 250-
35	Dennis Breitzman	Bureau of Reclamation	(701) 250-
36	Genevieve Thompson	Audubon Society	(701) 298-
37	Charles Fritz	Red River Basin Board	(218) 291-
38	Tim Keller	Bureau of Reclamation	(701) 250-